

Appl. No. : 09/787,784
Filed : July 30, 2001

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 9-30. Claims 9-18, 21-24, and 26-30 have been amended, and new matter has been added. Thus, Claims 9-30 are presented for further examination. The amendments to Claims 9-18, 21-24, and 26-30 are merely for clarification or to conform the claims to U.S. practice, and thus do not narrow the scope of protection. Reconsideration and allowance of all Claims 9-30 in light of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 9-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,751,733 to Delayaye, et al (Delayaye).

Delayaye discloses a system which repeatedly enciphers a digital word under the control of a key. (See Column 1 Lines 54-62). According to the system, portions of the input word are scrambled in a permutation circuit. Each resulting portion is used as an address in a memory so as to map the scrambled input into a second word. The process of scramble and map repeats a number of times, after which a final scramble occurs. The result is an enciphered word which can be deciphered back to the input word with knowledge of the enciphering algorithm.

The Delayaye system does not, however, include all of the limitations of Applicants Claims 9. For example, the Delayaye system does not have a first encryption module configured to encrypt data for an intended recipient, wherein a first encrypted part and a remaining encrypted part, the first encrypted part carrying information for decryption of the remaining encrypted part such that the remaining encrypted part can be decrypted only after decrypting the first encrypted part. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that Claim 9 overcomes the Delayaye art, and is in condition for allowance. Furthermore, as Claims 10-17 each depend from Claim 9, applicant respectfully submits that Claims 10-17 are also in condition for allowance.

Similarly the Delayaye system does not include all of the limitations of Applicants Claims 18. For example, the Delayaye system does not disclose a method comprising encrypting data for an intended recipient, wherein a first encrypted part and a remaining encrypted part are produced, the first encrypted part carrying information for decryption of the remaining encrypted part such that the remaining encrypted part can be decrypted only after decrypting the first

Appl. No. : 09/787,784
Filed : July 30, 2001

encrypted part. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that Claim 18 overcomes the Delayaye art, and is in condition for allowance. Furthermore, as Claims 19-26 each depend from Claim 18, applicant respectfully submits that Claims 19-26 are also in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, the Delayaye system does not include all of the limitations of Applicants Claims 27 and 28. For example, Delayaye does not disclose a signature module configured to sign the data block. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that Claims 27 and 28, which contain this limitation, overcome the Delayaye art, and are in condition for allowance.

Similarly, the Delayaye system does not include all of the limitations of Applicants Claims 29 and 30. For example, Delayaye method does not disclose signing the data block. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that Claims 29 and 30, which contain this limitation, overcome the Delayaye art, and are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of these amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are not made for patentability purposes, and it is believed that the claims would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments. Rather, these amendments have only been made to increase claim readability, to improve grammar, and to reduce the time and effort required of those in the art to clearly understand the scope of the claim language. Furthermore, any new claims presented above are, of course, intended to avoid the prior art, but are not intended as replacements or substitutes of any cancelled claims. They are simply additional specific statements of inventive concepts described in the application as originally filed.


Appl. No. : 09/787,784
Filed : July 30, 2001

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 1/5/06

By: 
John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

2256691
010306